arXiv:math/0703477v2 [math.LO] 15 Aug 2007

THEORIES WITH EF-EQUIVALENT NON-ISOMORPHIC MODELS

Saharon Shelah

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
(Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics
Hill Center-Busch Campus
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

Abstract. Our "large scale" aim is to characterize the first order T (at least the countable ones) such that: for every ordinal α there λ, M_1, M_2 such that M_1, M_2 are non-isomorphic models of T of cardinality λ which are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent. We expect that as in the main gap ([Sh:c, XII]) we get a strong dichotomy, so in the non-structure side we have stronger, better example, and in the structure side we have a parallel of [Sh:c, XIII]. We presently prove the consistency of the non-structure side for T which is $\aleph_0$-independent (= not strongly dependent) or just not strongly$_4$ stable, even for $\mathrm{PC}(T_1, T)$ and more for unstable T (see [Sh:c, VII] or [Sh:h]) and infinite linear order I.

The author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support of this research (Grant No.242/03). Publication 897
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

ANNOTATED CONTENT

§0 Introduction

§1 Games, equivalences and the question

> [We discuss what are the hopeful conjectures concerning versions of EF-equivalent non-isomorphic models for a given complete first order T, i.e. how it fits classification. In particular we define when M_1, M_2 are $\mathrm{EF}_{\gamma,\lambda}$-equivalent and when they are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\gamma,\theta,\lambda}$-equivalent and discuss those notions.]

§2 The properties of T and relevant indiscernibility

> [We recall the definitions of "T strongly dependent", "T is strongly$_4$ dependent", and prove the existence of models of such T suitable for proving non-structure theorey.]

§3 Forcing EF^+-equivalent non-isomorphic models

> [We force such an example.]

§4 Theories with order

> [We prove in ZFC, that for λ regular there are quite equivalent non-isomorphic models of cardinality λ^+.]

§0 Introduction

Our aim is to prove

- ☒ if $T \subseteq T_1$ are complete first order theorem T which is not strongly stable, ordinal α and $\lambda > |T|$ (or at least for many such λ's) then
  - $(*)$ there are $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{PC}(T_1, T)$ of cardinality λ which are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent for every $\alpha < \lambda$ but not isomorphic (or $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$, see below, it is a somewhat stronger relative of $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent).

Concerning constructing non-isomorphic $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent models M_1, M_2 (with no relation to T) we have intended to continue [Sh 836], or see more Havlin-Shelah [HvSh 866] and see history in Vaananen in [Va95].

By [Sh:c] we essentially know for T countable complete first order when there are $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(T_\tau)$-equivalent non-isomorphic model of T of cardinality λ for some λ, see §4; this is exactly when T is superstable with NDOP, NOTOP.

On restricting ourselves to models of T for "$\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent non-isomorphic", Hyttinen-Tuuri [HyTu91] started, then Hyttinen-Shelah [HySh 474], [HySh 529], [HySh 602]. The notion "$\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent" is introduced here, in Definition 1.4.

Concerning variants of strongly dependent theories see [Sh 783],[Sh 863] (and in preparation [Sh:F705]), most relevant is [Sh 863, §5], part (F). The best relative for us is "strongly$_4$ dependent", a definition of it is given below.

We choose as our test problem the version of being fat/lean. We prove here that if T is not strongly stable then T consistently is fat. More specifically, for every $\mu = \mu^{<\mu} > |T|$ there is a μ-complete class forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ the theory T is fat. Moreover, this is true for non-strongly$_4$ stable T. The result holds even for $\mathrm{PC}(T_1, T)$.

Also if T is unstable or has the DOP or OTOP (see [Sh:c]) then it is fat, i.e. already in $\mathbf{V}$.

Of course, forcing the example is a drawback, but note that for proving there is no positive theory it is certainly enough. Hence it gives us an upper bound on the relevant dividing lines.

On Eherenfeucht-Mostowski models, see [Sh:e, III] or [Sh:c, VII] or [Sh:h], [Sh:e, III,§1]. I thank the referee for pointing out that [HySh 602] was forgotten hence as Definition 1.4 was not yet written, the main result 3.1 had not said anything new.

0.1 Definition. Let T be a complete first order theory.
1) We say T is fat when for every ordinal κ, for some (regular) cardinality $\lambda > \kappa$ there are non-isomorphic models M_1, M_2 of T of cardinality λ which are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\beta,\kappa,\kappa,\lambda}$-equivalent for every $\beta < \lambda$ (see Definition 1.4 below).

2) If T is not fat, we say it is lean.
3) We say (T, T_1) is fat/lean if (T_1 is first order $\supseteq T$ and) $\mathrm{PC}(T_1, T) = \{M \restriction \tau_T : M$ a model of $T_1\}$ is as above.
4) We say $(T, *)$ is fat if for every first order $T_1 \supseteq T$ the pair (T, T_1) is fat. We say $(T, *)$ is lean otherwise.

0.2 Definition. 1) $\mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda) = \mathrm{EC}_T(\lambda)$ is the class of models of T of cardinality λ and $\mathrm{Mod}_T = \mathrm{EC}_T$ is $\cup\{\mathrm{EC}_T(\lambda) : \lambda$ a cardinality$\}$.
2) $\mathrm{PC}_\tau(T) = \{M \restriction \tau : M$ a model of $T\}$ where T is a theory or a sentence, in whatever logic, in a vocabulary $\tau_T \supseteq \tau$; if $\tau = \tau_T$ we may omit τ.
3) If $T \subseteq T_1$ are complete first order theories then $\mathrm{PC}(T_1, T) = \mathrm{PC}_{\tau(T)}(T_1)$.

§1 Games, equivalences and questions

What is the meaning in using $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$? Consider for various γ's the game $\Game_{\gamma,\lambda}(M_1, M_2)$ where $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda), T$ complete first order $\mathbb{L}(\tau)$-theory. During the play we can consider dependence relations on "short" sequences from M_ℓ (where $\le 2^{|\tau|+\aleph_0}$ is the default value), definable in a suitable sense. So if T is a well understood unsuperstable T like $\mathrm{Th}({}^\omega\omega, E_n)_{n<\omega}$ with $E_n := \{(\eta,\nu) : \eta,\nu \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ and } \eta \restriction n = \nu \restriction n\}$, then even for $\gamma = \omega + 2$ we have $E^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$- equivalence implies being isomorphic. This fits the thesis:

1.1 Thesis: The desirable dichotomy characterized, on the family of first order T, by the property "$M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda)$ are long game EF-equivalent iff they are isomorphic", is quite similar to the one in [Sh:c, XIII]; the structure side is e.g.: T is stable and every $M \in \mathrm{Mod}_T$ is prime over some $\cup\{M_\eta : \eta \in I\}$, where $\mathscr{T}$ is a subtree of ${}^{\kappa_r(T)>}\|M\|$ and $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow M_\eta \prec M_\nu \prec M, \|M_\eta\| \le 2^{|T|}$ and $\eta \triangleleft \nu \in T \Rightarrow \mathrm{tp}(M_\nu, \cup\{M_\rho : \rho \in T, \rho \restriction (\ell g(\nu)+1) \neq \eta \restriction (\ell g(\nu)+1))$ does not fork over M_ν, i.e. $\bar{M} = \langle M_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{T}\rangle$ is a non-forking tree of models with $\le \kappa_r||T|$ many levels.

We think the right (variant of the) question is from 1.2. Probably a reasonable analog is the situation in [Sh:c, XII,XIII]: the original question is on the function $\lambda \mapsto \dot{I}(\lambda, T)$, the number of non-isomorphic models; but the answer is more transparent for $\lambda \mapsto \dot{I}\dot{E}(\lambda, T)$.

If $\lambda = \mu^+, \mu = \mu^{|T|} = \mathrm{cf}(\mu), T = \mathrm{Th}({}^\omega\omega, E_n)_{n<\omega}$ then by Hyttinen-Shelah [HySh 529]; for $\gamma \ge \mu\omega$ we get equivalence $\Rightarrow$ isomorphic, but not for $\gamma < \mu\omega$; for some universes $\mathbf{V}$, 1.6 is parallel to that. This seems to indicate that $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\gamma,\lambda}$ is suitable for the questions we are asking.

So the natural question concerning such equivalences is (see [Sh:a], [Sh:E53]).

1.2 Question: Classify first order complete T, or the countable ones by

Version $(A)_1$: For which ordinals α, there are λ non-isomorphic $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda)$ which are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent (at least, e.g. in some $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}$ is $(2^{|T|+|\alpha|})^+$-complete forcing notion).

Version $(A)_0$: Similar version for $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$.

Version $(B)_1$: For every cardinal $\kappa > |T|$ and vocabulary $\tau_1 \supseteq \tau_T$ and $\psi \in \mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\omega}(\tau_1)$ such that $\mathrm{PC}_\tau(\psi) \subseteq \mathrm{EC}_T$ has members of arbitrarily large cardinality we have $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ where

- (a) for every cardinal μ in $\mathrm{PC}_\tau(\psi) = \{M \restriction \tau : M \text{ a model of } \psi\}$ there is a μ^*-saturated member

- (b) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ there are $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{PC}_\tau(\psi)$ of cardinality λ with non-isomorphic τ-reducts which are $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$-equivalent.

Version $(\mathrm{B})_0$: Like $(\mathrm{B})_1$ for $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\lambda}$.

Version $(\mathrm{C})_1$: Like $(\mathrm{B})_1$ using $\psi = \wedge T_1$ where T_1 is first order $\supseteq T$.

Version $(\mathrm{C})_0$: Like $(\mathrm{B})_0$ using $\psi = \wedge T_1$ where T_1 is a first order $\supseteq T$.

For reasons to prefer version (C) over (B) - see [Sh:E53].

Now by the works quoted above, (see §4); at least if, e.g. $(\forall \kappa)(\exists^\infty \lambda)(\lambda^\kappa = \lambda \wedge 2^\lambda = \lambda^+)$ show that T satisfies $(\mathrm{A})_0$ iff T is superstable NDOP, OTOP iff $(\mathrm{B})_0$. Of course if we change the order of the quantifier (for "for some λ for every $\alpha < \lambda$",...) this is not so, but we believe solving $(\mathrm{A})_1$ and/or $(\mathrm{B})_1$ will do much also for this.

1.3 Definition. 1) We say that M_1, M_2 are EF_α-equivalent if M_1, M_2 are models (with same vocabulary) such that the isomorphism player has a winning strategy in the game $\Game^\alpha_1(M_1, M_2)$ defined below.
1A) Replacing α by $< \alpha$ means: for every $\beta < \alpha$; similarly below.
2) We say that M_1, M_2 are $\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha,\mu}$-equivalent or $\Game^\alpha_\mu$-equivalent when M_1, M_2 are models with the same vocabulary such that the isomorphism player has a winning strategy in the game $\Game^\alpha_\mu(M_1, M_2)$ defined below.
3) For M_1, M_2, α, μ as above and partial isomorphism f from M_1 into M_2 we define the game $\Game^\alpha_\mu(f, M_1, M_2)$ between the players ISO, the isomorphism player and AIS, the anti-isomorphism player as follows:

- (a) the play lasts α moves
- (b) after β moves a partial isomorphism f_β from M_1 into M_2 is chosen increasing continuous with β
- (c) in the $\beta + 1$-th move, the player AIS chooses $A_{\beta,1} \subseteq M_1, A_{\beta,2} \subseteq M_2$ such that $|A_{\beta,1}| + |A_{\beta,2}| < 1 + \mu$ and then the player ISO chooses $f_{\beta+1} \supseteq f_\beta$ such that
  $A_{\beta,1} \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f_{\beta+1})$ and $A_{\beta,2} \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(f_{\beta+1})$
- (d) if $\beta = 0$, ISO chooses $f_0 = f$; if β is a limit ordinal ISO chooses $f_\beta = \cup\{f_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$.

The ISO player loses if he had no legal move for some $\beta < \alpha$, otherwise he wins the play.
4) If $f = \emptyset$ we may write $\Game^\alpha_\mu(M_1, M_2)$. If μ is 1 we may omit it. We may write $\leq \mu$ instead of μ^+.

1.4 Definition. 1) For $k \in \{0,1\}$ the models M_1, M_2 are $\mathrm{EF}^{+,k}_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}$-equivalent but, if $k = 1$ we may omit it when the isomorphism player, ISO, has a winning strategy in the game $\eth_{\gamma,\theta,\mu}(M_1, M_2)$ defined below.

If $\mu = \min\{\|M_1\|, \|M_2\|\}$ then we may omit it. If also $\theta = 2^{|\tau(M_\ell)|+\aleph_0}$ we may omit it, too.

2) For an ordinal γ, cardinals $\theta \le \mu$, vocabulary τ and τ-models M_1, M_2 and partial isomorphism f from M_1 to M_2, we define a game $\eth = \eth_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}(f, M_1, M_2)$, between the player ISO (isomorphism) and AIS (anti-isomorphism). The models are $\eth_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}$-equivalent if the ISO player has a winning strategy.

A play last γ moves; in the β-th move a partial isomorphism f_β from M_1 to M_2 is chosen by ISO, extending f_α for $\alpha < \beta$ such that $f_0 = f$ and for limit β we have $f_\beta = \cup\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ and for every $\beta < \alpha$ the set $\mathrm{Dom}(f_{\beta+1}) \setminus \mathrm{Dom}(f_\beta)$ has cardinality $< 1 + \mu$; let f^ℓ_β be f_β if $\ell = 1$, f^{-1}_β if $\ell = 2$.

During a play, the player ISO loses if it has no legal move and he wins in the end of the play iff he always had a legal move.

In the $(\beta + 1)$-th move, the AIS do one of the following cases:

Case 1: The AIS player chooses $A_\ell = A^\ell_\beta \subseteq M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ such that $|A_1| + |A_2| < 1 + \mu$ and then ISO chooses f_β as above such that $A_\ell \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^\ell_\beta)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

Case 2: First the AIS player chooses a $\varepsilon < \theta$ and[1] dependence relation $\mathbf{R}_\ell$ on ${}^\varepsilon(M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ (see Definition 1.5 below) and $\mathscr{A}_\ell \subseteq {}^\varepsilon(M_\ell)$ of cardinality λ for $\ell = 1$ such that:

$\odot$ (a) if $k = 0$ then $\mathbf{R}_\ell = [{}^\varepsilon(M_\ell)]^{<\aleph_0}$, so really an empty case

(b) if $k = 1$ then $\mathbf{R}_\ell$ is a 1-dependence relation (see 1.5(4)(b)(B))

(c) if $k = 1, \ell = 1, 2$ and $n < \omega$ and $\bar a_0, \dots, \bar a_{n-1} \in {}^\varepsilon(M_\ell)$ then the truth value of $\{\bar a_0, \dots, \bar a_{n-1}\} \in \mathbf{R}_\ell$ depends just on the complete first order type which $\langle \bar a_0, \dots, \bar a_{n-1}\rangle$ realizes on $\mathrm{Dom}(f^\ell_\beta)$ inside the model M_ℓ.

Second, the ISO does one of the following.

Subcase 2A: The player ISO chooses $\langle(\bar a^1_\zeta, \bar a^2_\zeta) : \zeta < \lambda\rangle$ such that for $\ell = 1, 2$:

(α) for each $\zeta < \lambda, \bar a^\ell_\zeta \in {}^\varepsilon(M_\ell)$

(β) $\langle \bar a^\ell_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\rangle$ is independent for R_ℓ

(γ) each $\bar a \in \mathscr{A}_\ell$ depends on $\{\bar a^\ell_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\}$.

---

[1] probably if we require "$\mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$-definable $\mathbf{R}_\ell$ such that f maps the definition of $\mathbf{R}_1$ to the one of $\mathbf{R}_2$" we get the same answer; moreover we can demand it is as in the case of using regular types.

Then AIS chooses $\zeta < \lambda$ and ISO chooses $f_{\beta+1} \supseteq f_\beta$ such that $f_\beta(\bar{a}^1_\zeta) = \bar{a}^2_\zeta$.

Subcase 2B: The player ISO chooses $f_{\beta+1} \supseteq f_\beta$ as required such that for some $n < \omega$ and $\bar{a}^1_\ell \in {}^\varepsilon\mathrm{Dom}(f_\beta)$ for $\ell \le n$ we have: $\{\bar{a}^1_0, \dots, \bar{a}^1_{n-1}\}$ is $\mathbf{R}_1$-dependent iff $\{f_\beta(\bar{a}^1_0), \dots, f_\beta(\bar{a}^1_{n-1})\}$ is not $\mathbf{R}_2$-dependent.

1.5 Definition. 1) We say $\mathbf{R}$ is a dependence relation on X when $\mathbf{R}$ is a subset of $[X]^{<\aleph_0}$.
2) For $X, \mathbf{R}$ as above, we say $Y \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{R}$-independent when $[Y]^{<\aleph_0} \cap \mathbf{R} = \emptyset$; of course, an index set with repetitions is considered dependent.
3) We say $\mathbf{R}$ or $(X, \mathbf{R})$ has character $\le \kappa$ when for every $\mathbf{R}$-independent $Y \subseteq X$ and $\{x\} \subseteq X$ for some $Z \in [Y]^{<\kappa}$ the set $(Y \backslash Z) \cup \{x\}$ is $\mathbf{R}$-independent.
4) We say that $\mathbf{R}$ is a k-dependent relation on X when:

- (a) $\mathbf{R}$ is a subset of $[X]^{<\aleph_0}$
- (b) (α) if $k = 0$ then $\mathbf{R} = [X]^{<\aleph_0}$
  - (β) if $k = 1$, $\mathbf{R}$-independence satisfies the exchange principle (so dimension is well defined, as for regular types).

Remark. 1) So $\mathrm{EF}^{+,0}_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}$-equivalent means $\mathrm{EF}_{\gamma,\mu}$-equivalent.

1.6 Claim. *M_1, M_2 are isomorphic when:*

- (a) *M_1, M_2 are models of T of cardinality λ*
- (b) *M_1, M_2 are $\eth = \eth_{\omega+2,\aleph_1,\aleph_0,\lambda}$-equivalent*
- (c) *$T = \mathrm{Th}({}^\omega\omega, E_n)_{n<\omega}$.*

Proof. Step A: We choose a winning strategy $\mathbf{st}$ of the isomorphism player in the game $\eth_{\omega+2,\aleph_1,\aleph_0,\lambda}(M_1, M_2)$.

Step B: By the choice of T for $\ell = 1, 2$ we can find $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_\ell$ such that:

$\circledast_\ell$ (a) $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_\ell = \langle a^\ell_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{T}_\ell \rangle$

(b) $a^\ell_\eta \in M_\ell$

(c) if $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_\ell$ and $\ell g(\eta) = n$ then $\langle a^\ell_\nu / E^{M_\ell}_{n+1} : \nu \in \mathrm{suc}_{\mathscr{T}_\ell}(\eta) \rangle$ list $\{b/E^{M_\ell}_{n+1} : b \in a^\ell_\nu / E^{M_\ell}_n\}$ without repetitions.

Let $\mathscr{T}_{\ell,n} = \{\eta \in \mathscr{T}_\ell : \ell g(\eta) = n\}$ and let $\mathscr{T}_{\ell,\omega} = \{\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda : \eta \restriction n \in \mathscr{T}_\ell$ for every $n < \omega\}$.

Let $\bar\mu_\ell = \langle \mu^\ell_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{T}_{\ell,\omega}\rangle$, where

$$\mu^\ell_\eta = |\{b \in M_\ell : b \in a^\ell_{\eta\restriction n}/E^{M_\ell} \text{ for every } n < \omega\}|.$$

Step C:

Clearly

$\circledast$ M_1, M_2 are isomorphic iff there is an isomorphism h from $\mathscr{T}_1$ onto $\mathscr{T}_2$ (i.e. h maps $\mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ onto $\mathscr{T}_{2,n}, h$ preserves $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ and $\eta \ntriangleleft \nu$) such that letting $h_n = h \restriction \mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ and h_ω be the mapping from $\mathscr{T}_{1,\omega}$ onto $\mathscr{T}_{2,\omega}$ which h induces (so $h_\omega(\eta) = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} h_n(\eta \restriction n)$) we have $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,\omega} \Rightarrow \mu^1_\eta = \mu^2_{h_\omega(\eta)}$.

Step D:

By induction on n we choose $h_n, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_n$ such that

$\circledast$ (a) h_n is a one-to-one mapping from $\mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ onto $\mathscr{T}_{2,n}$

(b) if $m < n$ and $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ then $h_m(\eta \restriction m) = (h_n(\eta)) \restriction m$

(c) $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\eta = \langle \mathbf{x}^n_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,n}\rangle$

(d) (α) $\mathbf{x}^n_\eta$ is an initial segment of a play of the game $\Game_{\omega+2,\aleph_1,\aleph_0,\lambda}(M_1, M_2)$

(β) in $\mathbf{x}^n_\eta$ only finitely many moves have been done
(can specify)

(γ) the player ISO uses his winning strategy $\mathbf{st}$

(e) if $\eta_1 \in \mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ and $\eta_2 = h_n(\eta_2)$, then for some $b_1 \in \operatorname{Dom}(f^{\mathbf{x}^n_\eta})$
we have

(α) $b_1 \in a^1_\eta/E^{M_1}_n$

(β) $f^{\mathbf{x}^n_\eta}(b) \in a^2_{h_n(\eta)}/E^{M_2}_n$

(f) if $\nu \triangleleft \eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,n}$ then $\mathbf{x}^{\ell g(\nu)}_\nu$ is an initial segment of $\mathbf{x}^n_\eta$.

Why can we carry the induction?

For $n = 0$:

Note that h_0 is uniquely determined. As for $\mathbf{x}^0_{<>}$, any $\mathbf{x}$ as in $\circledast(d)$ is O.K., as long as at least one move was done (note that $E^{M_\ell}_0$ has one and only one equivalence class.

For $n = m + 1$: So $h_m, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_m$ has been chosen.

Let $\eta_1 \in \mathscr{T}_{1,m}$ and let $\eta_2 = h_m(\eta_1)$.
Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{F}_{\eta_1} = \{(\nu_1,\nu_2) : & \nu_1 \in \text{ suc}_{\mathscr{T}_1}(\eta_1), \nu_2 \in \text{ suc}_{\mathscr{T}_2}(\eta_2) \\ & \text{and there is } \mathbf{x} \text{ as in } \circledast(d) \text{ such that} \\ & \mathbf{x}^m_{\eta_1} \text{ is an initial segment of } \mathbf{x} \text{ and for some} \\ & b_1 \in \text{ Dom}(f^{\mathbf{x}}) \text{ we have} \\ & b_1 \in a^1_{\nu_1}/E^{M_1}_n \text{ and } f^{\mathbf{x}}(b_1) \in a^2_{\nu_2}/E^{M_2}_n\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now

$\odot_1$ to do the induction step, it suffices to prove, if $\eta_1 \in \mathscr{T}_{1,m}$ then there is a one-to-one function h_{n,η_1} from $\text{suc}_{\mathscr{T}_1}(\eta_1)$ onto $\text{suc}_{\mathscr{T}_2}(\eta_2)$ such that $\nu \in \text{suc}_{\mathscr{T}_1}(\eta_1) \Rightarrow (\nu, h_{n,\eta_1}(\nu)) \in \mathbf{F}_{\eta_1}$.

However by case 2 in Definition 1.4 this holds.

Stage E:

So we can find $\langle h_n : n < \omega\rangle, \langle \mathbf{x}_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{T}_1\rangle$ as in $\circledast$. Let $h := \cup\{h_n : n < \omega\}$, clearly it is an isomorphism from $\mathscr{T}_1$ onto $\mathscr{T}_2$ and h_ω is well defined, see $\circledast$ of Stage C.

So it is enough to check the sufficient condition for $M_1 \cong M_2$ then, i.e. $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,\omega} \Rightarrow M_{1,\eta} = M_{2,h_\omega(\eta)}$. But if $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_{1,\omega}$ then $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\eta\restriction n} : n < \omega\rangle$ is a sequence of initial segments of a play of $\Game$ with ISO using his winning strategy **st**, increasing with n, each with finitely many moves. So $\mathbf{x}_\omega$, the limit $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\eta\restriction n} : n < \omega\rangle$ is an initial segment of the play $\Game$, with $\le \omega$ moves and $f^{\mathbf{x}_\omega} = \cup\{f^{\mathbf{x}_n} : n < \omega\}$.

Clearly $n < \omega \Rightarrow f(a^1_{\eta\restriction n}) E^{M_2}_n a^2_{h_n(\eta\restriction n)}$. As we have one move left and can use case 2 in Definition 1.4(2) we are done. $\square_{1.6}$

1.7 Claim. *M_1, M_2 are $\Game_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}$-equivalent when:*

- (a) *M_1, M_2 are τ-models*
- (b) *$\lambda = \lambda_1^+, \lambda_1 \ge \mu$ and $\theta \le \mu \le \lambda$ and $\gamma \le \mu$ and $\text{cf}(\mu) < \mu \Rightarrow \lambda_1 > \mu$ and $\lambda \in \check{I}[\lambda]$*
- (c) *M_1, M_2 are $\Game^{\gamma(*)}_\mu$-equivalent where $\gamma(*) = \lambda_1 \times \gamma$ (see Definition 1.3).*

Proof. First, we do not save on $\gamma(*)$, say use $\lambda_1 \times \lambda_1 \times \gamma$.

Let **st** be a winning strategy of the ISO player in the game $\Game^{\gamma(*)}_\mu$. We try to use it as a winning strategy of the ISO player in the game $\Game_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}(M_1, M_0)$. Well, the $f^{\mathbf{x}}$ has two large domains, so "on the side" in the β-th move ISO play $\mathbf{x}_\beta$ for $\Game_{\gamma,\theta,\mu,\lambda}$ and $A^1_\beta \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\mathbf{x}_\beta})$ of cardinality $< \mu$ (or $\le \mu$ if $\mu > \mathrm{cf}(\mu) \wedge \beta \ge \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$) and he actually plays $f^{\mathbf{x}_\beta} \restriction A^1_\beta$.

The only problem is when $\beta = \alpha + 1$ and in Definition 1.4, Case 2 occurs with the AIS player choosing $\mathbf{R}^1_\beta, \mathbf{R}^2_\beta$. We can choose $\varepsilon < \theta$ and deal only with $\underset{\sim}{A}_\ell \cap {}^{\varepsilon}(M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

We can consider $\mathbf{x}_\beta$ extending $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ if it is as required in subcase (2B) of Definition 1.4 we are done. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{F}^1_\beta = \{(\bar a_1, \bar a_2) : &\text{ for some } \varepsilon < \theta, \bar a_c \in {}^{\varepsilon}(M_\ell) \text{ for } \ell = 1,2\\ &\text{and there is a candidate } \mathbf{x}_\beta \text{ for the}\\ &\beta\text{-th move such that } f^{\mathbf{x}_\beta}(\bar a_1) = \bar a_2!\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\mathbf{F}^2_\beta = \{(\bar a_2, \bar a_1) : (\bar a_1, \bar a_2) \in \mathbf{F}^1_\beta\}$$

$$\mathscr{A}^1_\ell = \mathscr{A}_\ell$$

$$\mathscr{A}^2_\ell = \{\bar a \in \mathscr{A}_\ell : \text{ the number of } \bar b \text{ such that } (\bar a, \bar b) \in \mathbf{F}^\ell_\beta \text{ is } \le \lambda\}$$

$$\mathscr{A}^3_\ell = \mathscr{A}^2_\ell \cup \{\bar a : \text{ for some } \bar b \in A^2_{3-\ell} \text{ we have } (\bar a, \bar b) \in \mathbf{F}^\ell_\beta\}.$$

So $|\mathscr{A}^3_\ell| \le \lambda$ and let $\langle \bar a^\ell_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\rangle$ list $\mathscr{A}^3_\ell$ possibly with repetitions

(∗) it is enough to take care of $\mathscr{A}^3_\ell \cap \mathscr{A}_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

[Why? By the basic properties of regular dependence relation.]

So we can continue.

Let S be the set of limit ordinals $\delta < \lambda$ such that: for a club of $\delta_* \in [\delta, \lambda)$ of cofinality $\aleph_0$ we can find $\langle \bar b^\ell_\zeta : \zeta \in [\delta, \delta_*)\rangle$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ such that:

(α) $\bar b^\ell_\zeta \in \{\bar a^\ell_\xi : \xi \in [\delta, \delta_*)\}$

(β) $(\bar b^1_\zeta, \bar b^2_\zeta) \in \mathbf{F}$

(γ) $\langle \bar b^\ell_\zeta : \zeta \in [\delta, \delta_*)\rangle$ is R_ℓ-independent over $\{\bar a^\ell_\zeta : \zeta < \delta\}$

(δ) if $\zeta < \delta_*$ and $\bar a^\ell_\zeta \in \mathscr{A}_\ell$ then $\bar a^\ell_\zeta$ does R_ℓ-depend on $\{\bar a^\ell_\zeta : \zeta < \delta\} \cup \{\bar b^\ell_\zeta : \zeta \in [\delta, \delta_*)\}$.

If S is not stationary we can easily finite (we start by playing ω moves in $\Game^{\mu,\gamma(?)}_\lambda$). So assume S is stationary, hence for some regular $\sigma \le \lambda_1$ the set $S' = \{\delta \in S : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \sigma\}$ is stationary. By playing $\sigma + \omega$ moves (recalling $\lambda \in \check{I}[\lambda]_*$) we get a contradiction to the definition of S.

To get the exact $\gamma(*)$, we combine to partial isomorphisms. So we simulate two plays and use the composition of the $f^{\mathbf{x}^i_\beta}$'s from two plays where in each ISO use a winning strategy **st**. $\square_{1.7}$

1.8 Definition. 1) For any structure I we say that $\langle \bar a_t : t \in I\rangle$ is indiscernible (in the model $\mathfrak{C}$, over A) when: ($\bar a_t \in {}^{\ell g(\bar a_t)}\mathfrak{C}$ and) $\ell g(\bar a_t)$, which is not necessarily finite depends only on the quantifier type of t in I and:

> if $n < \omega$ and $\bar s = \langle s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}\rangle, \bar t = \langle t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}\rangle$ realizes the same quantifier-free type in I <u>then</u> $\bar a_{\bar t} := \bar a_{t_0} \char`^ \dots \char`^ \bar a_{t_{n-1}}$ and $\bar a_{\bar s} = \bar a_{s_0} \char`^ \dots \char`^ \bar a_{s_{n-1}}$ realizes the same type (over A) in $\mathfrak{C}$.

2) We say that $\langle \bar a_u : u \in [I]^{<\aleph_0}\rangle$ is indiscernible (in $\mathfrak{C}$, over A) similarly:

> if $n < \omega, w_0, \dots, w_{m-1} \subseteq \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\bar s = \langle s_\ell : \ell < n\rangle, \bar t = \langle t_\ell : \ell < n\rangle$ realizes the same quantifier-free types in I and $u_\ell = \{s_k : k \in w_\ell\}, v_\ell = \{t_k : k \in w_\ell\}$ <u>then</u> $\bar a_{u_0} \char`^ \dots \char`^ \bar a_{u_{n-1}}, \bar a_{v_0} \char`^ \dots \char`^ \bar a_{v_{n-1}}$ realize the same type in $\mathfrak{C}$ (over A).

3) If I is a linear order then we let $\mathrm{incr}({}^\alpha I) = \mathrm{incr}_\alpha(I) = \mathrm{incr}(\alpha, I)$ be $\{\rho : \rho$ is an increasing sequence of length α of members of $I\}$; similarly $\mathrm{incr}({}^{\alpha>}I)$-$\mathrm{incr}_{<\alpha}(I) = \mathrm{incr}(<\alpha, I) := \cup\{\mathrm{incr}_\beta(I) : \beta < \alpha\}$. So instead $[I]^{<\aleph_0}$ we may use $\mathrm{incr}_{<\omega}(I)$; clearly the difference is notational only.

§2 The properties of T and relevant indiscernibility

2.1 Definition. 1) $K^{\rm oi}_\lambda$ is the class of structures $\mathbf{J}$ of the form $(A, Q, P <, F_n)_{n<\omega} = (|\mathbf{J}|, P^{\mathbf{J}}, Q^{\mathbf{J}}, <^{\mathbf{J}}, F^{\mathbf{J}}_n)$, where $J = |\mathbf{J}|$ is a set of cardinality $\lambda, <^{\mathbf{J}}$ a linear order on $Q^{\mathbf{J}} \subseteq J, P^{\mathbf{J}} = |\mathbf{J}| \setminus Q^{\mathbf{J}}, F^{\mathbf{J}}_n$ a unary function, $F^{\mathbf{J}}_n \restriction Q^{\mathbf{J}} =$ the identity and $a \in A \setminus Q^{\mathbf{I}} \Rightarrow F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(a) \in Q^{\mathbf{J}}$ and $n \neq m \Rightarrow F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(a) \neq F^{\mathbf{J}}_m(a)$ and for simplicity $a \neq b \in P^M \Rightarrow \bigvee\limits_{n<\omega} F_n(a) \neq F_n(b)$; we add $n < m \Rightarrow F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(a) <^{\mathbf{J}} F^{\mathbf{J}}_m(a)$ (there is a small price). We stipulate $F^{\mathbf{J}}_\omega =$ the identity on $|\mathbf{J}|$ and $I^{\mathbf{J}} = (Q^{\mathbf{J}}, <^{\mathbf{J}})$.
2) For a linear order I and $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq$ inc$({}^\omega I)$ (see 1.8(3)), we let $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}_{I,\mathfrak{S}}$ be the derived member of $K^{\rm oi}$ which means: $|\mathbf{J}| = I \cup \mathfrak{S}, (Q^{|\mathbf{J}|}, <^{\mathbf{J}}) = I, F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(\eta) = \eta(n)$ for $n < \omega, F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(t) = t$ for $t \in I$.

2.2 Definition. 1) For a vocabulary τ_1 let $\Upsilon^{\rm oi}_{\tau_1}$ be the class of functions Φ with domain $\{\text{tp}_{\rm qf}(\bar t, \emptyset, \mathbf{J}) : \bar t \in {}^{\omega>}|\mathbf{J}|, \mathbf{J} \in K^{\rm oi}\}$ and if $q(x_0, \dots, s_{m-1}) \in$ Dom(Φ) then $\Phi(q)$ is a complete quantifier free n-type in $\mathbb{L}(\tau_1)$ with the natural compatibility functions.
2) Let $\Upsilon^{\rm oi}_\kappa = \{\Phi : \Phi \in \Upsilon^{\rm oi}_{\tau_1}$ for some vocabulary τ_1 of cardinality $\kappa\}$.
3) For $\Phi \in \Upsilon^{\rm oi}_\kappa$ let $\tau(\Phi) = \tau_\Phi$ be the vocabulary τ_1 such that $\Phi \in \Upsilon^{\rm oi}_{\tau_1}$.
4) For $\Phi \in \Upsilon^{\rm oi}_\kappa, \mathbf{J} \in K^{\rm oi}$ let EM$(\mathbf{J}, \Phi)$ be "the" τ_Φ-model M_1 generated by $\{a_t : t \in \mathbf{J}\}$ such that: $n < \omega, \bar t \in {}^n\mathbf{J} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\rm qf}(\langle a_{t_0}, \dots, a_{t_{n-1}}\rangle, \emptyset, M_1) = \Phi(\text{tp}_{\rm qf}(\langle t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}\rangle, \emptyset, \mathbf{J}))$.

5) If $\tau \subseteq \tau_\Phi$ then EM$_\tau(\mathbf{J}, \Phi)$ is the τ-reduct of EM(J, Φ).

2.3 Definition. 1) A (complete first order) T is $\aleph_0$-independent $\equiv$ not strongly dependent (this is from [Sh 783], see [Sh 863, §1]) when: there is a sequence $\bar\varphi = \langle \varphi_n(x, \bar y_n) : n < \omega\rangle$ (finite $\bar x$, as usual) of (first order) formulas such that T is consist with Γ_λ for some ($\equiv$ every $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$) where

$$\Gamma_\lambda = \{\varphi_n(x_\eta, \bar y^n_\alpha)^{\text{if}(\alpha=\eta(n))} : \eta \in {}^\omega\lambda, \alpha < \lambda, n < \omega\}.$$

2) T is strongly stable if it is stable and strongly dependent.

2.4 Definition. 1) We say that $\bar\varphi = \langle \varphi_i(\bar x, \bar y_i) : i < \kappa\rangle$ witness $\kappa < \kappa_{\text{ict},2}(T)$ when there are a sequence $\langle \bar a_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda, i < \kappa\rangle$ and $\langle \bar b_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ such that

- (a) $\langle \bar a_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over $\cup\{\bar a_{j,\beta} : j \in \kappa\backslash\{i\}$ and $\beta < \lambda\}$ for each $i < \kappa$
- (b) $\bar b_i \subseteq \cup\{\bar a_{j,\alpha} : j < i, \alpha < \lambda\}$

- (c) $p = \{\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{i,0} {}^\frown \bar{b}_i), \neg\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{i,1} {}^\frown \bar{b}_i) : i < \kappa\}$ is consistent (= finitely satisfiable in $\mathfrak{C}$).

2) $\kappa_{\text{ict},2}(T)$ is the first κ such that there is no witness for $\kappa < \kappa_{\text{ict},2}(T)$.
3) T is strongly^2 dependent (or strongly$^+$ dependent) if $\kappa_{\text{ict},2}(T) = \aleph_0$.
4) T is strongly^2 stable if it is strongly^2 dependent and stable.

2.5 Claim. *If T is first order complete, $T_1 \supseteq T$ is first order complete, without loss of generality with Skolem functions and T is not strongly dependent* then *we can find $\bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_n(x, \bar{y}_n) : n < \omega \rangle, \bar{y}_n \trianglelefteq \bar{y}_{n+1}$ such that*

- $\circledast$ *for any $\mathbf{J} \in K^{\text{oi}}$ we can find $M_\ell, \langle a_t : t \in \mathbf{J} \rangle$ such that*
  - (a) *M_1 is the Skolem hull of $\{\bar{a}_t : t \in \mathbf{J}\}$*
  - (b) *$\bar{a}_t \in {}^\omega M_1$ for $t \in I^{\mathbf{J}}, \bar{a}_\eta = \langle a_\eta \rangle \in M_1$ for $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}$*
  - (c) *$M_1 \models \varphi_n[\bar{a}_\eta, \bar{a}_t]$ iff $\eta(n) = t$ (pedantically we should write $\varphi_n(a_\eta, \bar{a}_t \restriction \lg(\bar{y}_n))$]*
  - (d) *$\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in \mathbf{J} \rangle$ is indiscernible in M_1 for the index model $\mathbf{J}$*
  - (e) *M_1 is a model of T_1*
  - (f) *in fact (not actually used, see 2.2) there is $\Phi \in \Upsilon^{\text{oi}}_{|T_1|}$ depending on $T_1, \bar{\varphi}$ only such that $M_1 = \text{EM}(I, \Phi)$, in fact if $n < \omega, \bar{t} = \langle t_\ell : \ell < n \rangle \in \mathbf{J}$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{a}_{t_0} {}^\frown \ldots {}^\frown \bar{a}_{t_{n-1}}, \emptyset, M_1) = \Phi(\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{t}, \emptyset, \mathbf{J}))$.*

Proof. By [Sh 863, §1] there is a sequence $\langle \varphi_n(x, \bar{y}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ as in Definition 2.3 and $\bar{y}_n \triangleleft \bar{y}_{n+1}$ for $n < \omega$; (recall that we can use dummy parameters).

Let I be an infinite linear order. We can find $M_1 \models T_1$ and a sequence $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in I \rangle$ with $\bar{a}_t \in {}^\omega(M_1)$ such that for every $\eta \in {}^\omega I$, the set $\{\varphi_n(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_t)^{\text{if}(\eta(n)=t)} : t \in I, n < \omega\}$ is a type, i.e. finitely satisfiable in $\eta \in M_1$.

Now without loss of generality $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in I \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence in M_1. Without loss of generality M_1 is λ^+-saturated, we then expand M_1 to M_1^+ by function $F_n^{M_1^+} (n < \omega)$, (of finite arity) such that $F_n(\bar{a}_{t_0}, \bar{a}_{t_1}, \ldots \bar{a}_{t_{n-1}})$ or more exactly $F_n(\bar{a}_{t_0} \restriction \ell g(\bar{y}_0), \bar{a}_{t_1} \restriction \ell g(\bar{y}_1), \ldots, \bar{a}_{t_{n-1}} \restriction \ell g(\bar{y}_{n-1}))$ realizes in M_1 the type $\{\varphi_\ell(x, \bar{a}_t)^{\text{if}(\eta(\ell)=t)} : t \in I, \ell < n\}$. Let M_2^+ be an expansion of M_1^+ by Skolem functions such that $|\tau_{M_2^+}| = |T_1|$, (natural, though not strictly required). Let D be a non-principal ultrafilter on ω and in $M_3^+ = (M_2^+)^\omega / D$, we let $\bar{a}'_t = \langle \bar{a}_t : n < \omega \rangle / D$, and $\bar{a}'_\eta = \langle F_n(\bar{a}_{\eta(0)}, \bar{a}_{\eta(1)}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{\eta(n-1)}) : n < \omega \rangle / D$ for $\eta \in \text{ incr}({}^\omega I)$. $\square_{2.5}$

2.6 Claim. *Assume* $\mathbf{J}_\ell \in K^{\rm oi}$, *and* $M_\ell, \bar{\varphi}, T_1, T$ *as in 2.5 for* $\ell = 1,2$. *A sufficient condition for* $M_1 \restriction \tau_T \ncong M_2 \restriction \tau_T$ *is:*

$(*)$ *if* f *is a function from* $\mathbf{J}_1$ *(i.e. its universe) into* $\mathscr{M}_{|T_1|,\aleph_0}(\mathbf{J}_2)$ *(i.e. the free algebra generated by* $\{x_t : t \in \mathbf{J}_2\}$ *in the vocabulary* $\tau_{|T_1|,\aleph_0} = \{F^n_\alpha : n < \omega$ *and* $\alpha < |T_1|\}, F^n_\alpha$ *has arity* n, *see more in [Sh:e, III,1]) we can find* $t \in P^{\mathbf{J}_1}, n < \omega$, *and* $s_1, s_2 \in Q^{\mathbf{J}_1}$ *such that:*

- (α) $F^{\mathbf{J}_1}_n(t) = s_1 \ne s_2$
- (β) *for* $\ell \in \{1,2\}$ *we have* $f(s_\ell) = \sigma(r^\ell_0, \dots, r^\ell_{k-1})$ *so* $k < \omega, r^\ell_t \in \mathbf{J}_2$ *for* $i < k$ *and* σ *is a* $\tau_{|T_1|,\aleph_0}$*-term not dependent on* ℓ
- (γ) $f(t) = \sigma^*(r_0, \dots, r_{m-1}), \sigma^*$ *is a* $\tau_{|T_1|,\aleph_0}$*-term and* $r_0, \dots, r_{m-1} \in \mathbf{J}_2$
- (δ) *the sequences*

$$\langle r^1_i : i < k\rangle\hat{\ }\langle r_i : i < m\rangle$$

$$\langle r^2_i : i < k\rangle\hat{\ }\langle r_i : i < m\rangle$$

realize the same quantifier free type in $\mathbf{J}_2$ *(note: we should close by the* $F^{\mathbf{J}_2}_n$, *so type mean the truth value of the inequalities* $F_{n_1}(r') \ne F_{n_2}(r')$ *(including* F_ω*) and the order between those terms).*

$\square_{2.6}$

Proof. Straight (or as in [Sh:e, Ch.III]).

Remark. We could have replaced Q by the disjoint union of $\langle Q^{\mathbf{J}}_n : n < \omega\rangle, <^{\mathbf{J}}$ linearly order each $Q^{\mathbf{J}}_n$ (and $<^{\mathbf{J}} = \cup\{< \restriction Q^{\mathbf{J}_1}_n : n < \omega\}$ and use Q_n to index parameters for $\varphi_n(x, \bar{y}_n)$. Does not matter at present.

But for our aim we can replace "not strongly stable" by a weaker demand. Recall (from [Sh 863, §5](G), i.e. [Sh 863, 5.39=dw5.35tex](2A) the following is an equivalent definition.

2.7 Definition. 1) A (complete first order) T is not strongly$_4$ dependent if there is a sequence $\bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_n(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_n) : n < \omega\rangle$ (finite $\bar{x}$ of length $m < \omega$, as usual) of (first order) formulas an infinite linear order I, an indiscernible $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {\rm incr}_{<\omega}(I)\rangle$ with $\ell g(\bar{a}_\eta) \le \omega$ and letting $B = \cup\{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {\rm incr}_{<\omega}(I)\rangle$ for some $p \in \mathbf{S}^m(B)$ for every $k < \omega$ there is $n < \omega$, satisfying: for no linear order I^+ extending I and subset I_0 of I^+ with $\le k$ members, do we have:

- $\otimes$ if $\bar{t}^1, \bar{t}^2$ are increasing sequences from I of the same length $< n, \ell < n$ realizing the same quantifier type over I_0 in I^+ and for $i = 1,2$ we let $\bar{b}^i = (\ldots \hat{} \bar{a}_{\langle t^i_{\eta(\ell)} : \ell < \ell g(\eta) \rangle} \restriction n \hat{} \ldots)_{\eta \in \text{ inc}_{<\omega}(n)}$ then $\ell < n \wedge u \subseteq n \wedge u \subseteq \ell g(\bar{b}^1) \wedge |u| = \ell g(\bar{y}_\ell) \Rightarrow \varphi_\ell(x, \bar{b}^1 \restriction u) \in p \Leftrightarrow \varphi_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{b}^2 \restriction u) \in p$.

1A) In (1) without loss of generality $\bar{y}_n \triangleleft \bar{y}_{n+1}$ for $n < \omega$.
2) T is strongly$_4$ stable if it is stable and strongly dependent.

Remark. 1) We can write the condition in 2.7(1) without I^+ speaking on finite sets as done in $(*)$ in the proof of 2.8 below.
2) In 2.7 by compactness we can get such $\langle \bar{a}'_\rho : \rho \in \text{ inc}_{<\omega}(I') \rangle$ for any infinite linear order I'.

Next we deduce a consequence of failing Definition 2.7 helpful in proving non-structure results.

2.8 Claim. *If T is first order complete, $T_1 \supseteq T$ is first order complete, without loss of generality with Skolem function and T is not strongly$_4$ dependent as witnessed by $\bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_n(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$, i.e. as in Definition 2.7(1A), then there is $\tau_1 \supseteq \tau_{T_1}, |\tau_1| = |T_1|$ and $\bar{\sigma}_n(\bar{z}_n) = \langle \sigma_{n,\ell}(\bar{z}_n) : \ell < \ell g(\bar{\sigma}_n) \rangle, \sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a τ_1-term such that:*

- $\circledast$ *if $I, \mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}_{I,\mathfrak{S}}$ are as in Definition 2.1(2), then there are M_1 and $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in I \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \mathfrak{S} \rangle$ such that:*
  - (α) *M_1 is a τ_1-model and is the Skolem hull of $\{\bar{a}_t : t \in I\} \cup \{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}\}$ (we write $\bar{a}_t$ for $t \in \mathbf{J}$ for uniformity)*
  - (β) *$\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in \mathbf{J} \rangle$ is indiscernible in M_1,*
  - (γ) *if $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $k < \omega$ then for large enough $n(*)$ we have:*
    - $(*)$ *if $u \subseteq n(*), |u| \leq k$, then we can find $\bar{s}, \bar{t}$ and $n_* < n(*)$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ such that*
      - (i) *$\bar{s}, \bar{t}$ are sequences of members of $\{F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(\eta) : n < n(*)\}$*
      - (ii) *$\ell g(\bar{s}) = \ell g(\bar{t}) \leq n(*)$*
      - (iii) *$s_i <_I s_j \Leftrightarrow t_i <_I t_j$ for $i, j < \ell g(\bar{s})$*
      - (iv) *if $i < \ell g(\bar{s}) = \ell g(\bar{t})$ then $(\forall n \in u)(F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(\eta) \leq_I s_i \equiv F^{\mathbf{J}}_n(\eta) \leq_I t_i)$*
      - (v) *$\bar{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_i(\bar{y}) : i < \ell g(\bar{y}_{n_*}) \rangle$*
      - (vi) $M_1 \models \varphi_{n_*}[\bar{a}_\eta, \ldots, \sigma^{M_1}_i(\bar{a}_{t_0}, \bar{a}_{t_1}, \ldots), \ldots]_{i \leq \ell g(\bar{y}_{n_*})} \equiv \neg\varphi_{n_*}[\bar{a}_\eta, \ldots, \sigma^{M_1}_i(\bar{a}_{s_0}, \bar{a}_{s_1}, \ldots), \ldots]_{i \leq \ell g(\bar{y}_{n_*})}$
  - (δ) *M_1 is a model of T_1 so $\tau_{M_1} \supseteq \tau_{T_1}$.*

Proof. Fix $I, \mathfrak{S}$; without loss of generality I is dense with neither first nor last element and is $\aleph_1$-homogeneous hence there are infinite increasing sequences of members of I.

Let $I, \langle \varphi_n(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_n) : n < \omega \rangle, \langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I) \rangle$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^m(\cup\{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I)\})$ exemplify T is not strongly$_4$ dependent, i.e. be as in the Definition so $m = \ell g(\bar{x})$. For notational simplicity assume $m = 1$.

Now in 2.7 we can add:

- $(*)$ there is a sequence $\langle (n_k, m_k, I^*_k) : k < \omega \rangle$ such that $k < n_k < m_k, m_k < m_{k+1}, I^*_k \subseteq I$ has m_k members, for no $I_0 \subseteq I^*_k$ with $\leq k$ members does $\otimes$ from 2.7 holds for $\bar{t}^1, \bar{t}^2 \in \text{ incr}_{<n_k}(I^*_k)$ and (k, n_k) here standing for k, n.

[Why? By compactness.]

Without loss of generality I is the reduct to the vocabulary $\{<\}$, i.e. to just a linear order of an ordered field $\mathbb{F}$ and $t_q \in \mathbb{F}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ are such that $0 <_{\mathbb{F}} t_q, (t_{q_1})^2 <_{\mathbb{F}} t_{q_2}$ for $q_1 <_{\mathbb{F}} q_2$ (hence $n < \omega \Rightarrow n <_{\mathbb{F}} t^n_{q_1} <_{\mathbb{F}} t_{q_2}$). By easy manipulation without loss of generality $I^*_k = \{t_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, m_k\}$.

Now for each $m < \omega$ and $\eta \in \text{ incr}_m(I)$ we can choose c_η such that if $m = m_k$ then for some automorphism h of I mapping I^*_k onto $\text{Rang}(\eta)$, letting $\hat{h}$ be an automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ mapping $\bar{a}_\nu$ to $\bar{a}_{h(\nu)}$ for $\nu \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I)$, the element c_η realizes $\hat{h}(p)$ and $\langle c_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I) \rangle$ is without repetitions.

Now without loss of generality $\langle \langle c_\eta \rangle \hat{}\, \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I) \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence and let $a_t = c_{<t>}$ be such that M_0 be a model of T_1 such that $\cup\{\langle c_\eta \rangle \hat{}\, \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I)\} \subseteq M_0 \restriction \tau \prec \mathfrak{C}$. Without loss of generality $\langle \langle c_\eta \rangle \hat{}\, \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in \text{ incr}_{<\omega}(I) \rangle$ is indiscernible in M_0 and we can find an expansion M_1 of M_0 such that $|\tau_{M_2}| = |T_1|$ such that $\bar{a}_\eta = \langle F_{\ell g(\eta), i}(a_{\eta(0)}, \dots, a_{\eta(n-1)}) : i < \ell g(\bar{a}_\eta) \rangle, c_\eta = F_{\ell g(\eta)}(a_{\eta(0)}, \dots, a_{\eta(n-1)})$ if $\eta \in \text{ incr}_n(I)$ and M_1 has Skolem functions.

By manipulating I without loss of generality we can find $I_* \subseteq I$ of order type ω. So

- $\odot$ if $t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ list I_*, for every $k < \omega$ for every n large enough $H^{M_1}_n(a_{t_0}, a_{t_1}, \dots, a_{t_{n-1}})$ satisfies the demand (from clause (γ) in the claim).

Let $\mathscr{D}$ be a non-principal ultrafilter on ω such that $\{m_k : k < \omega\} \in \mathscr{D}$, let M_2 be isomorphic to $M^\omega_1/\mathscr{D}$ over M_1, i.e. $M_1 \prec M_2$ and there is an isomorphism $\mathbf{f}$ from M_2 onto $M^\omega_1/\mathscr{D}$ extending the canonical embedding.

If η is an increasing ω-sequence of members of I, we let

$$a^n_\eta = H^{M_1}_n(a_{\eta(0)}, \dots, a_{\eta(n-1)}) \in M_1$$

and let

$$a_\eta = \mathbf{j}^{-1}(\langle a^0_\eta, a^1_\eta, \dots, a^n_\eta, \dots : n < \omega \rangle / D) \in M_2.$$

Let M'_2 be the Skolem hull of $\{a_t : t \in I\} \cup \{a_\eta : \eta \in \mathfrak{S}\}$ inside M_2. It is easy to check that it is as required. $\square_{2.8}$

As in [Sh:e, III].

2.9 Claim. *Assume* $\mathbf{J}_\ell \in K^{\text{oi}}$, *and* $M_\ell, \bar{\varphi}, T_1, T$ *as in 2.8 for* $\ell = 1, 2$. *A sufficient condition for* $M_1 \not\cong M_2$ *is*

(∗) *if* f *is a function from* $\mathbf{J}_1$ *(i.e. its universe) into* $\mathscr{M}_{|T_1|, \aleph_0}(\mathbf{J}_2)$ *(i.e. the free algebra generated by* $\{x_t : t \in \mathbf{J}_1\}$ *the vocabulary* $\tau_{|T_1|, \aleph_0} = \{F^n_\alpha : n < \omega$ *and* $\alpha < |T_1|\}, F^n_\alpha$ *has arity* n, *see [Sh:e, III,§1]) we can find* $t \in P^{\mathbf{J}_1}$ *and* $k_* < \omega$ *such that for every* $n_* < \omega$ *we can find* $\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2$ *such that:*

(α) $\bar{x}_1, \bar{s}_2 \in {}^k I$ *are increasing,* $\bar{s}_1 = \langle F^{\mathbf{J}}_n : n < n_* \rangle$ *and* $n < k_* \Rightarrow s_{2,n} = s_{1,n}$ *and* $s_{1,n_*-1} <_I s_{2,k_*}$

(β) $f(\bar{s}_\ell) = \bar{\sigma}(r^\ell_0, \dots, r^\ell_{k-1})$ *so* $k < \omega, r^\ell_t \in \mathbf{J}_2$ *for* $i < k$ *so* σ *is a* $\tau_{|T_1|, \aleph_0}$*-term not dependent on* ℓ

(γ) $f(t) = \sigma^*(r_0, \dots, r_{m-1}), \sigma^*$ *is a* $\tau_{|T_1|, \aleph_0}$*-term and* $r_0, \dots, r_{m-1} \in \mathbf{J}_2$

(δ) *the sequences*

$$\langle r^1_i : i < k \rangle\hat{\ }\langle r_i : i < m \rangle$$

$$\langle r^2_i : i < k \rangle\hat{\ }\langle r_i : i < m \rangle$$

realize the same quantifier free type in $\mathbf{J}_2$ *(note: we should close by the* $F^{\mathbf{J}_2}_n$, *so type mean the truth value of the inequalities* $F_{n_1}(r') \neq F_{n_2}(r')$ *(including* F_ω*) and the order between those terms).*

Proof. As in [Sh:e, III], [Sh 300, III], called unembeddability. $\square_{2.9}$

§3 Forcing EF$^+$-equivalent Consistency non-isomorphic models

The following result is not optimal, but it is enough to show that the conditions on T should be enough. If you like just to get the main point for [Sh:F660], i.e. to show that not strongly$_4$ stable is a relevant dividing line note the following claim. As for unstable T, see below.

So our main result is

3.1 Claim. *Assume* $(\bar{\varphi}, T, T_1)$ *is as in 2.7 or 2.8 and* $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} \geq |T_1|, T$ *stable.* *__Then__ for some* λ*-complete* λ^+ *c.c. forcing notion* $\mathbb{Q}$ *we have:* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *"there are models* M_1, M_2 *of* T *of cardinality* λ^+ *such that* $M_1 \restriction \tau(T), M_2 \restriction \tau(T)$ *are* $\mathrm{EF}_{\lambda,\lambda^+}$*-equivalent and even* $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\lambda,\lambda,\lambda^+}$*-equivalent for every* $\alpha < \lambda$ *but are not isomorphic".*

3.2 Remark. 1) It should be clear that we can improve it allowing $\alpha < \lambda^+$ and replacing forcing by e.g. $2^\lambda = \lambda^+ + \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$, but anyhow we are trying to find the right dividing lines.
2) For T unstable, this is easier - see 4.2.

Proof. We define $\mathbb{Q}$ as follows:

$\circledast_1$ $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ iff p consist of the following objects satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) $u = u^p \in [\lambda^+]^{<\lambda}$ such that $\alpha + i \in u \wedge i < \lambda \Rightarrow \alpha \in u$
- (b) $<^p$ a linear order of u such that

$$\alpha, \beta \in u \wedge \alpha + \lambda \leq \beta \Rightarrow \alpha <^p \beta$$

- (c) for $\ell = 1,2$ $\mathfrak{S}^p_\ell$ is a subset of $\{\eta \in {}^\omega u : \eta(n) + \lambda \leq \eta(n+1)$ for $n < \omega\}$ such that $\eta \neq \nu \in \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell \Rightarrow \mathrm{Rang}(\eta) \cap \mathrm{Rang}(\nu)$ is finite; note that in particular $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell$ is without repetitions and is $<^p$-increasing
- (d) Λ^p a set of $< \lambda$ increasing sequences of ordinals from $\{\alpha \in u^p : \lambda | \alpha\}$ hence of length $< \lambda$
- (e) $\bar{f}^p = \langle f^p_\rho : \rho \in \Lambda^p \rangle$ such that
- (f) f^p_ρ is a partial automorphism of the linear order $(u^p, <^p)$ such that $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(f'_\rho) \Rightarrow \alpha + \lambda = f^p_\rho(\alpha) + \lambda$ and we let $f^{1,p}_\rho = f^p_\rho, f^{2,p}_\rho = (f^p_\rho)^{-1}$
- (g) if $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell, \rho \in \Lambda^p, \ell \in \{1,2\}$ then $\mathrm{Rang}(\eta)$ is included in $\mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\rho)$ or is almost disjoint to it (i.e. except finitely many "errors")
- (h) if $\rho \triangleleft \varrho \in \Lambda^p$ then $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ and $f^p_\rho \subseteq f^p_\varrho$

(*i*) $f^{ell,p}_{<>}$ is the empty function and if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ has limit length then

$$f^p_\rho = \cup\{f^p_{\rho \restriction i} : i < \ell g(\rho)\}$$

(*j*) if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ has length $i+1$ then $\mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\rho) \subseteq \rho(i)$ for $\ell = 1,2$

(*k*) if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ and $\eta \in {}^\omega(\mathrm{Dom}(f^p_\rho))$ then $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^p_1 \Leftrightarrow \langle f^p_\rho(\eta(n)) : n < \omega\rangle \in \mathfrak{S}^p_2$

(ℓ) if $\rho_n \in \Lambda^p$ for $n < \omega$ and $\rho_n \triangleleft \rho_{n+1}$ and $\lambda > \aleph_0$ then $\cup\{\rho_n : n < \omega\} \in \Lambda$.

$\circledast_2$ We define the order on $\mathbb{Q}$ as follows: $p \le q$ iff ($p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and)

(*a*) $u^p \subseteq u^\varphi$

(*b*) $\le^p = \le^q \restriction u^p$

(*c*) $\mathfrak{S}^p_\ell \subseteq \mathfrak{S}^q_\ell$ for $\ell = 1,2$

(*d*) $\Lambda^p \subseteq \Lambda^q$

(*e*) if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ then $f^p_\rho \subseteq f^q_\rho$

(*f*) if $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^q_\ell \setminus \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell$ then $\mathrm{Rang}(\eta) \cap u^p$ is finite

(*g*) if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ and $f^p_\rho \neq f^q_\rho$ then $u^p \cap \sup \mathrm{Rang}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,q}_\rho)$ for $\ell = 1,2$

(*h*) if $\rho \in \Lambda^p$ and $\ell \in \{1,2\}, \alpha \in u^p \setminus \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\rho)$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,q}_\rho)$ then $f^{\ell,p}_\rho(\alpha) \notin u^p$

(*i*) if $n < \omega$ is non-zero and $\rho_k \in \Lambda^p, \ell_k \in \{1,2\}$ for $k < n$ and $\alpha_k \in u^q$ for $k \le n, f^{\ell_k,q}_{\rho_k}(\alpha_k) = \alpha_{k+1}$ for $k < n$, and for no $k, \ell_k \neq \ell_{k+1} \wedge (\exists\rho)[\rho \trianglelefteq \rho_k \wedge \rho \trianglelefteq \rho_{k+1} \wedge \alpha_k \in \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell_k,p}_\rho))]$ then

(α) if $\alpha_0 = \alpha_n$ then $\alpha_0 \in \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell_0,p}_{\rho_0})$

(β) if $\alpha_0 \in u^p$ and $\alpha_1 \notin u^p$ then $\alpha_n \notin u^p$.

Having defined the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ we start to investigate it

$\circledast_3$ $\mathbb{Q}$ is a partial order of cardinality λ^+.
[Why? Obviously.]

$\circledast_4$ (*i*) if $\bar p = \langle p_i : i < \delta\rangle$ is $\le^{\mathbb{Q}}$-increasing, δ a limit ordinal $< \lambda$ of uncountable cofinality then $p_\delta := \cup\{p_i : i < \delta\}$ defined naturally is an upper bound of $\bar p$

(*ii*) if $\delta < \lambda^+$ is a limit ordinal of cofinality $\aleph_0$ and the sequence $\bar p = \langle p_i : i < \delta\rangle$ is increasing (in $\mathbb{Q}$), then it has an upper bound.

[Why (*i*)? Think or see (ii); why the case $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$ is easier? Because of clause $\circledast(y)(i)$.

[Why (*ii*)? We define $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ as follows: $u^q = \cup\{u^{p_i} : i < \delta\}, <^q = \cup\{<^{p_i} : i < \delta\}, \Lambda^q = \cup\{\Lambda^{p_i} : i < \delta\} \cup \{\rho : \rho$ is an increasing sequence of ordinals from u^q of length a limit ordinal of cofinality $\aleph_0$ such that $\varepsilon < \lg(\rho) \Rightarrow \rho \restriction \varepsilon \in \cup\{\Lambda^{p_i} : i < \delta\}\}$. Lastly, $\mathfrak{S}^q_\ell$ is the closure of $\cup\mathfrak{S}^{p_i}_\ell : i < \delta\}$ under clause (k) of $\circledast_1$, where by clauses (f)-(i) of $\circledast_2$ this works.]

We choose $\mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_\ell := \cup\{S^{p_\delta}_{\ell,n} : n < \omega\}$ where the pair $(\mathfrak{s}^{p_\delta}_{1,n}, \mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_{2,n})$ is chosen by induction on $n < \omega$ by:

for $n = 0$: $\mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_{\ell,n} = \cup\{\mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_\ell : \alpha < \delta\}$.

for $n + 1$: $\mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_{\ell,n+1} = \{f^{3-\ell,p_\delta}_\rho(\eta) : \rho \in \Lambda^{p_\delta}$ and $\eta \in S^p_{\ell,n}$ and $\mathrm{Rang}(\eta) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^{3-\ell,p_\delta}_\rho)\}$.

First, let us check $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Clause: For each $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_\ell, n < \omega$ we have $\eta(n) + \lambda \leq \eta(n+1)$ as for each $\rho \in \Lambda^{p_\delta}$ we have $\forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,p_\delta}_\rho))(\alpha < \lambda \leq \beta = p^{\ell,p_\delta}_\rho(\alpha) + \lambda \leq f^{\ell,p_\delta}_\rho(\beta))$.

Why? $\eta_1 \neq \eta_2 \in \mathfrak{S}_\ell \Rightarrow \aleph_0 > |\mathrm{Rang}(\eta_1) \cap \mathrm{Rang}(\eta_2)|$? Otherwise, choose a counterexample, let $\delta(*) = \sup \mathrm{Rang}(\eta_1)$ so $\langle \eta_m(i) : i < \omega \rangle$ is increasing with limit $\delta(*)$ for $m = 1, 2$, see $\circledast_1$.

For $m = 1, 2$ so we can find $\alpha_m = \alpha(m), \langle (\rho_{m,k}, \eta_{m,k}, \ell_{m,k}) : k < \eta_m \rangle$ and stipulate $\eta_m, n_m = \eta_m$ such that:

$\odot_1$ (a) $n_m < \omega$

(b) $\alpha_m < \delta$

(c) $\rho_{m,k} \in \Lambda^{p_\delta}$

(d) $\eta_{k,0} \in \mathfrak{S}^{p_{\alpha,m}}_\ell$

(e) $\ell_{m,k}\ in \{1, 2\}$

(f) $f^{\ell_{m,k,p}}_{\rho_{m,k}}$ maps $\eta_{m,k}$ to $\eta_{m,k+1}$ so $\mathrm{Rang}(\rho_{m,k}) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell_{m,k},p_\delta}_{\rho_{m,k}})$.

Without loss of generality we choose such $\eta_1, \eta_2, n_1, \ldots$ such that $n_1 + n_2$ is minimal hence

$\odot_2$ (a) $(m_1, m_2) \neq (0, 0)$

(b) if $\rho \trianglelefteq \rho_{m,k}, \rho \trianglelefteq \rho_{m,k+1}, \delta(*) \leq \sup \mathrm{Rang}(\rho)$ then $\ell_{m,k} = \ell_{m,k+1}$

(c) if $n_m > 0$ then $\mathrm{Rang}(\eta_{m,0}) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell_{n,0},p_\delta}_{\rho_{m,0}})$ hence

$(c)^+$ if $n_m > 0$ then $\eta_{m,0}(i) \notin \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell_{m,0},p_\delta}_{p_{m,0}}$ for every large enough i

(d) if $(\rho_{1,0}, \ell_{1,\delta}) = (\rho_{2,0}, \ell_{2,0})$ then $\eta_{1,0} \neq \eta_{2,0}$

(e) if $n_1, n_2 > 0$ then $(\rho_{1,n_1}, \ell_{1,n_1}) \neq (\rho_{1,n_2}, \ell_{2,n_2})$.

Let $\alpha(*) < \delta$ be large enough such that

$\odot_3$ (a) $\alpha_1 < \alpha_n(*)$

(b) $\alpha_2 < \alpha_n(*)$

(c) if $m \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k < n_m$ then $\rho_{m,k} \in \Lambda^{p_{\alpha(*)}}$.

Now choose $i(*) < \omega$ large enough such that

$\odot_4$ (a) if $\eta_{1,0} \neq \eta_{2,0}$ then $i_1, i_2 \in [i(*), \omega) \Rightarrow \eta_{1,0}(i_1) \neq \eta_{2,0}(i_2)$ recalling $\eta_{1,0} \neq \eta_{2,0} \Rightarrow (\forall^\infty i < \omega)(\eta_{1,0}(i) \neq \eta_{2,0}(i))$

(b) if $n_m > 0$ then $i \in [i(*), \omega) \Rightarrow \eta_{m,0}(i) \notin u^{p_{\alpha(*)}}$.

It is enough to prove

$\odot_5$ if $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [i(*), \omega)$ then $\eta_1(i_1) \neq \eta_2(i_2)$, i.e. $\eta_{1,n_1}(i_1) \neq \eta_{2,n_2}(i_2)$.

[Why? If this fails, choose $\beta(*) \in (\alpha(*), \delta)$ such that for $m = 1, 2$ we have $\eta_{m,0}(i_m) \in \text{Dom}(p^{\ell_{m,0}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,0}}), f^{\ell_{m,0}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,0}}(i_m) \in \text{Dom}(p^{\ell_{m,1}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,1}})$ and generally $\alpha_{m,k} := (f^{\ell_{m,k}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,k}} \circ f^{\ell_{m,k-1}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,k}} \circ \ldots \circ f^{\ell_{m,0}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,0}})(i_m)$

$\text{Dom}(f^{\ell_{m,k+1}}, p_{\beta(*)}, p_{\rho_{m,k+1}})$ for $k = 0, \ldots, n_m - 1$.]

Let $n = n_1 + n_2, \alpha_k$ is $\alpha_{1,\ell}$ if $k \leq n_1$ and $\alpha_{2,k-n_1}$ if $k \in [n_1, n_2)$ (they are compatible as $\eta_1(i_1) = \eta_2(i_2)$) and (ρ_k, ℓ_k) is $(\rho_{1,k}, \ell_{1,k})$ if $k < n_1$ and $(\rho_{2,k-n_1}, 1 - \ell_{2,k-n_2})$ if $k \in [n_1, n_2)$. Now we get a contradiction to clause $(g)(\beta)$ of $\circledast_1$ for the case $p_{\alpha(*)} \leq p_{\beta(*)}$.

Clause (g):

So let $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}_\ell, \rho \in \Lambda^{p_\delta}$ where $\rho \in \{1, 2\}$ and we should prove that $\text{Rang}(\eta) \subseteq \text{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\rho)$ or $\text{Rang}(\eta) \cap \text{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\rho)$ is finite. For some $\alpha < \delta$ we have $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^{p_\alpha}_\ell$ and $\rho \in \cup\{\Lambda^{p_\beta} : \beta < \delta\} \Rightarrow \rho \in \Lambda^{p_\alpha}$. If $\rho \in \Lambda^{p_\alpha}$ then we use $p_\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ so assume $\rho \in \Lambda^{p_\delta} \setminus \cup \{\Lambda^{p_\beta} : \beta < \delta\}$.

For $\beta \in [\alpha, \delta)$ let $\gamma_\beta = \sup\{\gamma : \rho \restriction \beta \in \Lambda^{p_\beta}\}$, so γ_β is $\leq$-increasing, $\gamma_\beta < \ell g(\rho)$ and $\rho = \cup\{\rho \restriction \gamma_\beta : \beta \in [\alpha, \delta)\}$. So $\langle \eta(n) : n < \omega \rangle$ is increasing and for each $\beta \in (\alpha, \delta), w_\beta = \{n : \eta(n) \in \text{Dom}(f^{\ell,p_\beta}_{\rho \restriction \gamma_\beta})\}$ is finite.

Now by $\circledast_2(g)(\beta)$ applied to $p_\alpha \leq p_\beta$ for any $\beta \in (\alpha, \delta)$ we have $n \in (\omega \setminus w_\beta) \cap \text{Dom}(f^{\ell,p_\beta}_{\rho \restriction \gamma_\beta}) \Rightarrow f^{\ell,p_\beta}_{\rho \restriction \gamma_\beta}(\eta(n)) \notin u^{p_\alpha}$.

As $\text{Rang}(\eta) \subseteq u^{p_\alpha}$ we are done.

Clause (k):

By the choice of $\mathfrak{S}^{p_\delta}$.

Clause (l):

By the choice of Λ^{p_δ}.

Checking $p_\alpha \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} p_\delta$: (where $\alpha < \delta$)

We should check $\circledast_2$.

Clause (f):

As in the proof of $\circledast_1(c)$ above.

$\circledast_5$ $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies the λ^+-c.c.
[Why? Use $\triangle$-system lemma and check.]

$\circledast_6$ if $\alpha < \lambda^+$ then $\mathscr{I}^1_\alpha := \{p \in \mathbb{Q} : \alpha \in u^p\}$ is dense and open as well as $\mathbf{I}_* = \{p \in \mathbb{Q}$: if $\delta \in u^p, \lambda/\delta$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \lambda$ then $\delta = \sup(\delta \cap u)$.
[Why? Straight. For the first I^1_α, given $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ by

- (a) $u^p \cup \{\beta \leq \alpha : \beta + \lambda = \alpha + \lambda\}$, so clause $\circledast(a)$ holds
- (b) $<^p$ is the following linear order on u^q
  $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ iff $\alpha_1 <^p \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \wedge \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \nsubseteq u^p_1, \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \subseteq u^q$
- (c) $\Lambda^q = \Lambda^p$ and $f^q_\rho = f^p_\rho$ for $\rho \in \Lambda^q$
- (d) $\mathfrak{s}^q = S^p$.

Now check.

For the second, $\mathscr{I}_*$ use the first and $\circledast_4$

$\circledast_7$ if $\varrho \in \Lambda^* := \{\rho : \rho$ is an increasing sequence of ordinals $< \lambda^+$ divisible by λ of length $< \lambda\}$ then $\mathscr{I}^2_\varrho = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} : \varrho \in \Lambda^p\}$ is dense open.
[Why? Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}$, by $\circledast_6 + \circledast_4$ there is $q \geq p$ (from $\mathbb{Q}$) such that $\mathrm{Rang}(\varrho) \subseteq u^q$. If $\varrho \in \Lambda^q$ we are done, otherwise define q' as follows: $u^{q'} = u^q, <^{q'} = <^q$ $, \mathfrak{S}^{q'}_\ell = \mathfrak{S}^q_\ell, \Lambda^{q'} = \Lambda^q \cup \{\varrho \restriction \varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \mathrm{lg}(\varrho\}$ and if $i \leq \ell g(\varrho), \varrho \restriction i \notin \Lambda^q$ then we let $f^{q'}_{\varrho \restriction i} = \cup\{f^q_\rho : \rho \in \Lambda^q$ and $\rho \triangleleft \varrho \restriction i\}$]

$\circledast_8$ if ϱ is as in $\circledast_7$ and $\alpha < \lambda^+$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ then

$$\mathscr{I}^3_{\varrho,\alpha,\ell} = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} : \alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(f^{\ell,p}_\varrho) \text{ so } \varrho \in \Lambda^p, \alpha \in u^p\} \text{ is dense open.}$$

[Why? For any $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ there is $p^1 \geq p$ such that $\varrho \in \Lambda^{p_1}, \alpha \in u^{p_1}$, and $i < \ell g(\varrho) = \cup\{\varrho(j) : j < i\} \in u^p$ and $p_1 \in \mathbf{I}_*$, exists by $\circledast_6$. Now we shall use disjoint amalgamation.

For each $\delta \in u \cap$ sup $\mathrm{Rang}(\varrho)$ divisible by λ and let $u_\delta = u \cap [\delta, \delta + \lambda)$. So $f^p_\rho \restriction u_\delta$ is a partial function from u_δ into u_δ and $f^p_\rho = \cup\{f_\delta : \delta$ as above$\}$ can find f_δ such that

- (a) f_δ is a one-to-one function
- (b) $f^p_\varrho \restriction u_\delta \subseteq f_\delta$
- (c) if $\alpha \in$ $\mathrm{Dom}(f_\delta)$ then $\alpha \in u_\delta \cup f_\delta(\alpha) \in u_\delta$
- (d) $\mathrm{Dom}(f_i) \backslash u_\delta$ is an initial segment of $[\alpha^1_\delta, \alpha^2_\delta)$ of $[\delta_1, \delta + \lambda) \backslash u_\delta$
- (e) $\mathrm{Rang}(f_\delta) \backslash u_i$ is an initial segment $[\alpha^2_\delta, \alpha^7_\delta)$ of $[\delta_i, \delta + \lambda) \backslash u_i \backslash$ $\mathrm{Dom}(f_\delta)$
- (f) f_δ maps $[\alpha^1_\delta, \alpha^2_\delta)$ onto $u_\delta \backslash$ $\mathrm{Rang}(f^p_\varrho \restriction u_\delta)$
- (g) f_δ maps $u_i \backslash$ $\mathrm{Dom}(f^p_\varrho \restriction u_1)$ onto $[\alpha^2_\delta, \alpha^3_\delta)$.

Now we can find a linear order $<_1$ on $u_\delta \cup [\alpha^1_\delta, \alpha^3_\delta]$ such that f_i is order preserving (as the class of linear orders has amalgamation).

Lastly, we define q:

- (α) $u^q = u^p \cup \{[\alpha^1_\delta, \alpha^3_\delta) : i < \ell g(\varrho)$
- (β) $<^q$ is defined by $\alpha <^q \beta$ iff $(\exists \delta(\alpha <_\delta \beta)$ or $\alpha + \lambda \leq \beta$
- (γ) $\Lambda^q = \Lambda^p$
- (δ) $\mathfrak{s}^q_\ell = \mathfrak{s}^p_\ell$.]
- $\circledast_9$ define $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell \in K^{\rm oi}_\lambda$, a $\mathbb{Q}$-name as follows:
  - (a) $Q^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell} = \lambda^+$
  - (b) $\mathfrak{S}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell} = \cup\{\mathfrak{S}^p_\ell : p \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}\}$
  - (c) $<^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell} = \cup\{<^p : p \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}\}$
  - (d) $F_n^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell}$ is a unary function, the identity on λ^+ and
  - (e) $\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell} \Rightarrow F_n^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_n}(\eta) = \eta(n)$
- $\circledast_{10}$ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_\ell \in K^{\rm oi}_{\lambda^+}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

  [Why? Think]
- $\circledast_{11}$ if $\delta < \lambda^+$ is divisible by λ then $\Vdash$ "$\mathbf{J}_\ell \restriction \delta \in K^{\rm oi}_\lambda$ where $\mathbf{J}_\ell \restriction \delta = ((\delta \cup (P^{\mathbf{J}_\ell} \cap {}^\omega\delta), Q^{\mathbf{J}_\ell} \cap \delta, P^{\mathbf{J}_\ell} \restriction \delta, F^{\mathbf{J}_\ell}_n \restriction (\delta \cup (P^{\mathbf{J}_\ell} \cap {}^\omega\delta)))$
- $\circledast_{12}$ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "${\rm EM}_{\tau(T)}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_1, \Phi), {\rm EM}_{\tau(T)}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_2, \Phi)$ are ${\rm EF}_{\lambda,\lambda^+}$-equivalent; moreover ${\rm EF}^+_{\lambda,\lambda,\lambda^+}$-equivalence

(i.e. games of length $< \lambda$, and the player INC chooses sets of cardinality $< \lambda^+$). [Why? Recall $\Lambda^* = \{\rho : \rho$ is an increasing sequence of ordinals $< \lambda^+$ divisible by λ of length $< \lambda\}$ (is the same in $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$). For $\rho \in \Lambda^*$ let $\underset{\sim}{f}_\rho = \cup\{f^p_\rho : \rho \in \underset{\sim}{G}, \rho \in \Lambda^p\}$ and by $\circledast_1(f) + (j)$ easily $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}_\rho$ an isomorphism from $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_1 \restriction \sup {\rm Rang}(\rho)$ into $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_2 \restriction \sup {\rm Rang}(\rho)$".

Now $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "${\rm Dom}(\underset{\sim}{f}_\rho) = \sup {\rm Rang}(\rho)$" as if $\underset{\sim}{G} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$, for any $\alpha < \sup {\rm Rang}(\rho)$ for some $p \in \mathbf{G}$ we have $\alpha \in u^p$ by $\circledast_6$ and there is q such that $p \leq q \in \mathbf{G}, p \neq q$ by $\circledast_6$ too, so recalling $\circledast_2(g)$ we are done.

Similarly $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "${\rm Rang}(\underset{\sim}{f}_\rho) = \sup {\rm Rang}(\rho)$".

Also $\rho \triangleleft \varrho \Rightarrow \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \underset{\sim}{f}_\rho \subseteq \underset{\sim}{f}_\varrho$. For the ${\rm EF}^+$-version we have to analyze dependence relations, which is straight. So $\langle f_\rho : \rho \in \Lambda^* \rangle$ exemplify the equivalence.]

$\circledast_{13}$ for $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ let $\mathbf{J}^p_\ell \in K^{\rm oi}$ has universe $u^p \cup \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell, <^{\mathbf{J}_\ell} = <^p, Q^{\mathbf{J}^p_\ell} = u^p, F^{\mathbf{J}^p_\ell}_n(\eta) = \eta(n)$. We do not distinguish

$\circledast_{14}$ for $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\delta < \lambda^+$ divisible by $\lambda, p \restriction \delta$ is naturally defined and $p \restriction \delta \le_{\mathbb{Q}} p$. Let $q = p \restriction \delta$ be defined by:

- (a) $u^q = u^p \cap \delta$
- (b) $<^q = <^p \restriction \delta$
- (c) $\Lambda^q = \{\rho \in \Lambda^p : \sup \mathrm{Rang}(\rho) \le \delta\}$
- (d) $\mathfrak{S}^q_\ell = \{\eta \in \mathfrak{S}^p_\ell, \mathrm{Rang}(\eta) \subseteq \delta$

$\circledast_{15}$ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$M_1 = \mathrm{EM}_{\tau(T)}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_1, \Phi), \underset{\sim}{M}_2 = \mathrm{EM}_{\tau(T)}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_2, \Phi)$ are not isomorphic".

Why? For notational simplicity assume $\lambda > \aleph_0$. Let $\underset{\sim}{M}^+_\ell = \mathrm{EM}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{J}}_1, \Phi)$, and assume toward contradiction that $p \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "g is an isomorphism from M_1 onto M_2". For each $\delta \in S^{\lambda^+}_\lambda := \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \lambda\}$ we can find $p_\delta \in \mathbb{Q}$ above p and g_δ such that:

$\boxdot_1$ (a) $p \le p_\delta, \delta \in u^{p_\delta}$

(b) $p_\delta \Vdash$ "g_δ is $\underset{\sim}{g} \restriction \mathrm{EM}(\mathbf{J}^{p_\delta}, \Phi)$"

(c) g_δ is an isomorphism from $\mathrm{EM}_{\tau(T)}(\mathbf{J}^p_1, \Phi)$ onto $\mathrm{EM}_{\tau(T)}(\mathbf{J}^p_2, \Phi)$.

We can find stationary $S \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_\lambda$ and p^* such that

$\boxdot_2$ (a) $p_\delta \restriction \delta$, naturally defined is p^* for $\delta \in S$

(b) for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in S$, $u^{p_{\delta_1}}, u^{p_{\delta_2}}$ has the same order type and the order preserving mapping π_{δ_1,δ_2} from $u^{p_{\delta_2}}$ onto $u^{p_{\delta_1}}$ induce an isomorphism from p_{δ_2} onto p_{δ_1}.

Now choose $\eta^* = \langle \delta^*_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that

$\boxtimes_3$ (c) $\delta^*_n < \delta^*_{n+1}$

(d) $\delta^*_n = \sup(S \cap \delta^*_n)$ and $\delta_n \in S$.

We define $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ as follows

$\boxdot_4$ (e) $u^q = \cup\{p_{\delta^*_n} : n < \omega\}$

(f) $<^q = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha <^{p_{\delta^*_n}} \beta$ for some n or for some $m < n, \alpha \in u^{p_{\delta^*_m}} \setminus \delta^*_m$ and $\beta \in u^{p_{\delta^*_n}} \setminus \delta^*_n$

(g) $\mathfrak{S}^q_1 = \cup\{\mathfrak{S}^{p_{\delta^*_n}}_1 : n < \omega\} \cup \{\eta^*\}$

(h) $\mathfrak{S}^q_2 = \cup\{\mathfrak{S}^{p_{\delta^*_n}}_2 : n < \omega\}$
(i) $\Lambda^q = \cup\{\Lambda^{p_{\delta^*_n}} : n < u\}$
(j) $f^q_\rho = f^{p_{\delta^*_n}}_\rho$ if $\rho \in \Lambda^{p_{\delta^*_n}}$.

So there is (q_*, g^+) such that:

$\boxdot_5$ (a) $q \le q_*$
(b) $q_* \Vdash$ "$g^+ = \underset{\sim}{g} \restriction \text{ EM}(\mathbf{J}^{q_*}, \Phi)$
(c) g^+ is an autormorphism of $\text{EM}_{\tau(T)}(\mathbf{J}^{q_*}, \Phi)$.

The rest is as in 2.6, 2.8. $\square_{3.1}$

§4 Theories with order

Recall from [HySh 529, 3.19]:

4.1 Theorem. *If $\lambda = \mu^+, \mu = \mu^\kappa, \kappa =$ cf$(\kappa) < \kappa(T)$ then there are $EF_{\mu\times\kappa,\lambda,\lambda^+}$-equivalent non-isomorphic moels of cardinality λ.*

The new point in 4.2 is the EF^+ rather than EF.

4.2 Claim. *Assume $\lambda = \lambda^{<\theta}$ and λ is regular uncountable, $T \subseteq T_1$ are complete first order theories of cardinality $< \lambda$.*
1) If T is unstable then there are models M_1, M_2 of T_1 of cardinality λ^+, $\mathrm{EF}_{\lambda,\lambda^+}$ equivalent and even $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\lambda,\theta,\lambda^+}$-equivalence with non-isomorphic τ_T-reducts.
2) Assume $\Phi \in \Upsilon^{\mathrm{or}}_\kappa$ is proper for linear orders, $\bar\sigma = \langle \sigma_i(x) : i < i(*)\rangle$ a sequence of terms from $\tau_\Phi, \bar x^\ell = \langle x^\ell_i : i < i(*)\rangle, i(*) < \lambda, \varphi(\bar x^1, \bar x^2)$ is a formula in $\mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \tau \le \tau_T$ (any logic) and for every linear order I letting $M = \mathrm{EM}(I,\Phi), \bar b_t = \langle \sigma^M_i(a_t) : i < i(*)\rangle$ we have $(M \restriction \tau) \models \varphi[\bar b_s, \bar b_t]^{\mathrm{if}(s<t)}$ for every $s,t \in I$. Then there are linear orders I_1, I_2 of cardinality λ^+ such that M_1, M_2 are $\mathrm{EF}^+_{\lambda,\theta,\lambda^+}$-equivalent but not isomorphic where $M_\ell = \mathrm{EM}_\tau(I_\ell,\Phi)$ for $\ell = 1,2$.
3) If every $\mathrm{EM}_\tau(I,\Phi)$ is a model of T_1 then in (2) the models M_1, M_2 are in $\mathrm{PC}(T_1,T)$.

Proof. 1) Let $\varphi(\bar x,\bar y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ order some infinite subsets of ${}^mM$ for some $M \models T$.

Let Φ be as in [Sh:c, VII,VIII], i.e. proper for linear orders such that $\tau_{T_1} \subseteq \tau(\Phi), |\tau(\Phi)| = |T_1|$ and for every linear order I,$\mathrm{EM}(I,\Phi)$ is a model of T_1 satisfying $\varphi[\bar a_s, \bar a_s]$ iff $s <_I t$. Now we can apply part (2) with $i(*) = m$.
2) We choose I such that

$\circledast$ (a) I is a linear order of cardinality λ
  (b) if $\alpha,\beta \in (1,\lambda]$ then $(I \times \alpha) + (I \times \beta)^* \cong I$ (equivalently every α, $\beta \in [1,\lambda^+)$)
  (c) I is isomorphic to its inverse
  (d) I has cofinality λ.

For every $S \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_\lambda = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \lambda\}$ we define $I_S = \sum\limits_{\alpha<\lambda} I_{S,\alpha}$ where $I_{S,\alpha}$ is isomorphic to I if $\alpha \in \lambda\backslash S$ and isomorphic to the inverse of $I \times \omega$ otherwise. Now

$\circledast_2$ if $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_\lambda$ then $\mathrm{EM}(I_{S_2},\Phi)$, $\mathrm{EM}(I_{S_1},\Phi)$ are $\mathrm{EF}_{\lambda,\theta,\lambda^+}$-equivalent.

[Why? Straight.]

- $\circledast_3$ if $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_\lambda$ and $S_1 \backslash S_2$ is stationary, then $\mathrm{EM}_\tau(I_{S_1}, \Phi)$, $\mathrm{EM}_\tau(I_{S_2}, \Phi)$ are not isomorphic.

[Why? By the proof in [Sh 300, III,§3] (or [Sh:e, III,§3]) only easier. In fact, immitating it we can represent the invariants from there.]
3) Obvious. $\square_{4.2}$

4.3 Conclusion. Assume T is a (first order complete) theory.
1) If T is unstable, then $(T, *)$ is fat.
2) If T is unstable or stable with DOP, or stable with OTOP, then T is fat.
3) For every μ there is a μ-complete, class forcing $\mathbb{P}$ such that in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ we have: if T is not strongly stable or just not strongly$_4$ stable then T is fat, moreover $(T, *)$ is fat.

Remark. Also for $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(\tau_T)$ equivalent non-isomorphic of cardinality λ, justify.

Proof. 1) By 4.2.
2) Similar, the only difference is that the formula defining the "order" is not first order and the length of the relevant sequences may be infinite (see [Sh:c, XIII]).
3) Choose a class $\mathbf{C}$ of regular cardinals such that $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} \Rightarrow (2^{<\lambda})^+ < \mathrm{Min}(\mathbf{C} \backslash \lambda^+)$ and $\mathrm{Min}(\mathbf{C}) > \mu$. We iterate with full support $\langle \mathbb{P}_\mu, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\mu : \mu \in \mathbf{C}\rangle$ with $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\mu$ as in 4.2(2).

4.4 Claim. *Assume $T \subseteq T_1, \lambda = \lambda^\kappa$ is not necessary regular and $\kappa = cf(\kappa) < \kappa(\tau)$, e.g. T is unstable. Then there are $EF^+_{\lambda,\kappa,\lambda,\lambda^+}$-equivalent models from $PC(T_1, T)$ of cardinality λ^+.*

Proof. As in [HySh 529], seeing the previous proof. $\square_{4.2}$

As said in the introduction by the old results.

4.5 Conclusion.: (ZFC!) For first order countable complete first order theory T the following conditions are equivalent:

- (A) T is superstable with NDOP and NOTOP

$(B)_1$ if $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > |T|$ and $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda)$ are $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(\tau_T)$-equivalent then M_1, M_2 are isomorphic

$(B)_2$ like (B)$_1$ for some $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > |T|$

(C) if $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > T$ and $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda)$ are $\mathrm{EF}_{\omega,\lambda}$-equivalent then M_1, M_2 are isomorphic

(D) for some regular $\lambda > |T|$, if $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Mod}_T(\lambda^+)$ are $\mathrm{EF}_{\lambda,\lambda^+}$-equivalent then they are isomorphic.

Proof. Clause (A), clause (B)$_1$, clause (B)$_2$ are equivalent in [Sh:c, XIII]. Now by the definitions. Now trivially (B)$_1$ ⇒ (C) ⇒ (D).

Lastly, by [HySh 529] we have $\neg(A) \Rightarrow \neg(D)$, i.e. (D) ⇒ (A) so we have the circle. $\square_{4.5}$

REFERENCES.

[HvSh 866] Chanoch Havlin and Saharon Shelah. Existence of EF-equivalent Non-Isomorphic Models. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, **53**:111–127, 2007. math.LO/0612245.

[HySh 474] Tapani Hyttinen and Saharon Shelah. Constructing strongly equivalent nonisomorphic models for unsuperstable theories, Part A. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **59**:984–996, 1994. math.LO/0406587.

[HySh 529] Tapani Hyttinen and Saharon Shelah. Constructing strongly equivalent nonisomorphic models for unsuperstable theories. Part B. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **60**:1260–1272, 1995. math.LO/9202205.

[HySh 602] Tapani Hyttinen and Saharon Shelah. Constructing strongly equivalent nonisomorphic models for unsuperstable theories, Part C. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **64**:634–642, 1999. math.LO/9709229.

[HyTu91] Tapani Hyttinen and Heikki Tuuri. Constructing strongly equivalent nonisomorphic models for unstable theories. *Annals Pure and Applied Logic*, **52**:203–248, 1991.

[Sh 783] Saharon Shelah. Dependent first order theories, continued. *Israel Journal of Mathematic*, **accepted**. math.LO/0406440.

[Sh:e] Saharon Shelah. *Non–structure theory*, accepted. Oxford University Press.

[Sh 863] Saharon Shelah. Strongly dependent theories. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **submitted**. math.LO/0504197.

[Sh:a] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, xvi+544 pp, $62.25, 1978.

[Sh 300] Saharon Shelah. Universal classes. In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 264–418. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.

[Sh:c] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.

[Sh:h] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory of non elementary classes*, in preparation. ASL, 2005.

[Sh 836] Saharon Shelah. On long EF-equivalence in non-isomorphic models. In *Proceedings of Logic Colloquium, Helsinki, August 2003*, volume Lecture Notes in Logic 24, pages 315–325. ASL, 2006. math.LO/0404222.

[Sh:E53] Shelah, Saharon. Introduction to: stability theory for abstract elementary class.

[Sh:F705] Shelah, Saharon. Representation over orders of elementary classes.

[Sh:F660] Shelah, Saharon. Toward the main gap by fatness, a modest beginning.

[Va95] Jouko Vaananen. Games and trees in infinitary logic: A survey. In M. Mostowski M. Krynicki and L. Szczerba, editors, *Quantifiers*, pages 105–138. Kluwer, 1995.